UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/669,819	09/26/2000	Vellore T. Vetrivelkumaran	4254 15-752	4241

22971   7590   03/17/2006

MICROSOFT CORPORATION
ATTN: PATENT GROUP DOCKETING DEPARTMENT
ONE MICROSOFT WAY
REDMOND, WA 98052-6399

EXAMINER
POLLACK, MELVIN H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2145	

DATE MAILED: 03/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action *Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief*	09/669,819	VETRIVELKUMARAN ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Melvin H. Pollack	2145	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 01 March 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

   a) ☒ The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

   b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

     Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

<u>NOTICE OF APPEAL</u>

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

<u>AMENDMENTS</u>

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because

   (a)☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

   (b)☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);

   (c)☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

   (d)☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

     NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

   The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

   Claim(s) allowed: _____.

   Claim(s) objected to: _____.

   Claim(s) rejected: *1-4,6,9,15-17,19-22 and 26-33*.

   Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

<u>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</u>

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

<u>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</u>

11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>

12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.

13. ☐ Other: _____.

MHP   JASON CARDONE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the examiner finds the arguments non-persuasive in regards to the interpretation of the art.

Applicant alleges that Horman does not expressly disclose a status message capable of being interacted with by a user of the client computer to initiate the configuration change. In this case, a status message is paired with an interactive method of determining authentication credentials (col. 8, lines 23-30)

Applicant alleges that Horman does not expressly disclose automatically identifying configuation changes. Applicant's prior argument is reliant on full automation of configuration, including determination of configuration choices without manual intervention from the client. Indeed, Horman teaches that most of the system is automated, including determining before synchronization which script goes to which server (col. 7, line 65 - col. 8, line 10).

Applicant alleges that the administrative control database tracks data changes. The changes are clearly reflective of the state of each server (col. 5, lines 64 - col. 6, line 5) and are further used to specify the current state of each server to determine necessary changes (col. 6, lines 25-30). Specifically, it is the comparison of configurations between multiple servers that allows the server to determine what configuration changes are necessary (col. 9, lines 10-15).

Applicant claims that examiner erroneously uses two different entities for server computer. First, there is no limitation as to whether the identification of client configuration is performed by the client or by the server, and either configuration may teach on the claims as currently drawn. Second, the area cited regards matching the client with a group defined by the server automatically, and before the connection by the client.

Applicant claims that configuration changes do not affect client's interoperation with a server. Horman clearly teaches that the configuration changes are necessary in that they affect interoperation (col. 8, lines 50-55).

Applicant claims that the rejection does not expressly address the feature of a wizard. The examiner did indeed address this limitation (Para. 17, line 18).

Applicant claims that Glatt does not expressly disclose identification of client configuration changes necessitated by server configuration changes. Glatt teaches the usage of configuration changes to handle data location configuration (Para 4), and downloading of appropriat software versions.

Applicant claims that Horman does not expressly disclose "user actuable controls to effect client configuration change." Horman teaches the usage of client users to determine which updates to accept and their order (col. 13, line 60 - col. 14, line 5).

The examiner will detail each argument further in response to an RCE or Notice of Appeal.